

**COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REPORT**

for

PLUMAS COUNTY

prepared by the

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Revised Final Draft

June 11, 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
	TRANSMITTAL LETTER	5
1.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
2.0	INTRODUCTION	9
3.0	BACKGROUND	10
4.0	PURPOSE	11
5.0	LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW	11
6.0	SECTION 18788 (3) (A) THROUGH (H) ISSUES	11
	Overview	11
	Demographics	12
	Quantities of Waste	14
	Funding Sources	16
	Administrative Responsibilities	17
	Program Implementation	18
	Permitted Disposal Capacity	22
	Available Markets	23
	Implementation Schedule	23
	Other Issues	23
7.0	SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION	24
	Appendix A. Relevant Public Resources Code Sections	25
	Appendix B. California Code of Regulations 18788	27
	Appendix C. July 21, 2000 CIWMB Letter	28
	Appendix D. LTF Membership	31
	Appendix E. Presentation to the LTF	32
	Appendix F. March 25, 2004 LTF Letter to County	38

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

1834 EAST MAIN, QUINCY, CA 95971-9795 PHONE (530) 283-6268 FAX (530) 283-6323



TOM HUNTER
DIRECTOR

RICHARD HUMPHREY
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

MARTIN BYRNE
ASST. DIRECTOR

May 25, 2004

Ms Natalie Lee
Office of Local Assistance
California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB)
P. O. Box 4025
Sacramento, California 95812-4025

RE: Plumas County Five-Year Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan Review

Dear Ms. Lee:

On behalf of the City of Portola and Plumas County, please find attached a copy of the "Five-Year CIWMP Review Report" for Plumas County. In conformance with Section 41822 of the Public Resources Code (PRC), the County and the City of Portola have reviewed the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP).

The County's Local Task Force (LTF) submitted written comments to the County in conformance with Section 18788 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. A copy of the March 25, 2004 LTF letter is included in Appendix C of this "Five-Year CIWMP Review Report". This letter was signed and delivered to the County on April 28, 2004.

The County finds that a CIWMP revision is not necessary at this time. Guided by the current CIWMP and program adjustments made through the annual reports, the City and the County will continue to implement programs and strive to fulfill the goals of the Integrated Waste Management Act.

The County and the City are considering amending their NDFE's to update the list of facilities used by both jurisdictions. The County has also recommended that the City assess the feasibility of establishing an updated base year waste generation level, requesting a reduced diversion requirement, and/or explore the appropriateness of establishing a regional agency for reporting purposes.

Please contact me at (530) 283-6268 if you have any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Tom Hunter".

Tom Hunter
Public Works Director

cc John Sciborski, Chair, Plumas County Integrated Waste Management Task Force
Jim Murphy, City of Portola
Tom Valentino, City of Portola

CHAPTER 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

State law requires that each county, and the cities within the county, review their waste management planning documents every five years. The collection of planning documents is referred to as the "Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan" (CIWMP). The review is required to be conducted by the 5th year anniversary date from when the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) approved the CIWMP. The Plumas County CIWMP was approved by the CIWMB on January 28th, 1998. Thus, by January 28th, 2003, the County Local Task Force (LTF) was required to advise the County on whether the CIWMP needed to be revised. The LTF reviewed the CIWMP and determined that it was not necessary to revise the planning documents so long as the annual reports prepared by both jurisdictions continue to provide updates on the jurisdictions' efforts to achieve their diversion goals.

The overall framework of the CIWMP is still applicable. The goals, objectives, policies, waste management infrastructure, funding sources, and responsible administrative organizational units noted throughout the CIWMP are still applicable. State law also requires that the review address a number of issues, which are highlighted below in upper case, bold font.

DEMOGRAPHICS. The calculation of the diversion rates for both of the jurisdictions, in most cases, depends upon CIWMB-established adjustment factors, for example: population, employment, taxable sales, and the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Countywide population and industry employment have increased 6% and 14%, respectively, from 1990 to 2002. The greatest population increase has occurred in the unincorporated area of the County resulting in an increase of 7%, while the City's population has remained constant (only a 0.32% increase). Taxable sales transactions have increased, averaging 51% countywide. The statewide CPI increased 38% from 1990 to 2002. These factors are important because they are used to calculate the estimated waste generation and diversion rates when using the CIWMB adjustment methodology for diversion rate measurement. Additionally, this level of demographic growth infers increased waste generation. Yet, when evaluated on a yearly basis, the increase in countywide population is less than 1% per annum; in employment, slightly more than 1% per year; taxable sales, an increase of approximately 4% per year; and for the CPI, the increase averaged 3% per annum. Thus, growth was not that significant according to the demographic factors. While waste generation has increased modestly, both jurisdictions have continued to implement and expand diversion programs.

QUANTITIES OF WASTE. According to the adjustment methodology, waste generation has increased slightly for both jurisdictions from 1990 levels. The County requested and was approved for a base year waste generation correction in 1997. Since 1997, the estimated waste generation for the County has increased 10% - approximately 2% per annum. The City's waste generation has increased 10% from 1990 to 2002, which is less than 1% per annum.

Reported disposal tonnages have increased nearly twice as much as the 1990 levels in the County and approximately 4% for the City.

FUNDING SOURCES AND ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES. Funding amounts and sources and staffing levels have been maintained by both jurisdictions.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION. Program implementation, as documented by each jurisdiction in the annual reports, has been sustained. Most selected programs have been implemented and some new programs started.

PERMITTED DISPOSAL CAPACITY. Available countywide permitted disposal capacity totals 126,800 cubic yards, which is available at the Chester landfill. The Chester Landfill is planned as a backup to the Lockwood Landfill should some occurrence happen. At projected waste input rates, the jurisdictions rely on available disposal capacity at the Lockwood Landfill in the State of Nevada, east of Reno, and the Chester Landfill. These facilities have more than the required 15-years of disposal capacity available for Plumas County and the City of Portola solid wastes expected to be disposed.

AVAILABLE MARKETS. Markets for recoverable materials have fluctuated during the past decade depending upon the economy. The County has relied upon the private sector for exploring the marketability of recovered waste materials and supported the local RMDZ.

OTHER ISSUES. The goals, policies, and objectives stated in the Summary Plan remain applicable and relevant. The LTF continues to meet regularly, monitor countywide diversion performance, and provide useful input for the pursuit of AB 939 compliance strategies. Nearly all of the selected and contingent programs have been or are continuing to be implemented. Although a few programs have been revised, overall program implementation has been discussed in the annual reports and the Planning Annual Report Information System (PARIS) has been kept up to date. The County and City continue to monitor evolving compliance issues. The jurisdictions will continue to utilize the existing CIWMP as a planning tool augmented by the annual reports. Available resources will be directed toward the development and implementation of programs. Where feasible and practical, increased efforts will be directed to quantify (or estimate) diversion tonnages for implemented programs and recoverable materials. Each jurisdiction updates its annual report yearly to reflect current performance and identify any changes desired in program selection and implementation. In the 2002 annual reports, neither of the jurisdictions reported that any of their planning elements needed to be revised.

The County and City will consider amending their NDFE's to include the Delleker Transfer Station and any other recycling facilities and transfer stations used by the jurisdictions. The feasibility of establishing a regional agency for combining disposal reporting, diversion rate measurement, and AB 939 annual reporting, at a minimum, may be considered.

It is also recommended that the City consider: (1) establishing new base year waste generation reference; and (2) request a reduced rural diversion requirement.

The County is interested in discussing these changes with CIWMB staff to confirm that these planning changes can be made without allocating the additional resources to "revise" any of the planning documents. For these reasons, the County does not feel that revision of its CIWMP is warranted or desirable at this time.

CHAPTER 2.0 INTRODUCTION

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939) requires cities and counties in California to reduce the amount of solid waste disposed in landfills by 50% by the year 2000 and thereafter. This is to be accomplished through source reduction, recycling, and composting activities. Diversion credit of up to 10% can be achieved through the transformation of biomass materials. The CIWMP is the guiding document for attaining these goals. The content requirements of the CIWMP are identified in the Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 41751.

PRC Section 41822 requires each city and county to review its Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) or the CIWMP at least once every five years to:

- (1) correct any deficiencies in the element or plan;
- (2) comply with the source reduction and recycling requirements established under PRC Section 41780; and
- (3) revise the documents, as necessary.

The relevant sections of the PRC are included in Appendix A. Pursuant to the requirements of the PRC, the CIWMB clarified the five-year CIWMP review process in the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788 (See Appendix B). Section 18788 states that prior to the fifth anniversary of CIWMB Board approval of the CIWMP, the LTF shall complete a review of the CIWMP to assure that the County's waste management practices remain consistent with the hierarchy of waste management practices defined in PRC Section 40051.

The hierarchy stated in PRC 40051 is:

- (1) source reduction;
- (2) recycling and composting; and
- (3) environmentally safe transformation and environmentally safe land disposal.

The process identified in CCR 18788 is summarized as follows:

- prior to the 5th anniversary, the LTF shall submit *written comments* on areas of the CIWMP which require revision to the County and the CIWMB;
- within 45 days of receipt of comments, the County shall determine if a revision is necessary and notify the LTF and the CIWMB of its findings in a *CIWMP Review Report*; and
- within 90 days of receipt of the *CIWMP Review Report*, the CIWMB shall review the County's findings and, at a public hearing, approve or disapprove the County's findings.

CCR 18788 also identifies the minimum issues, which are to be addressed in the *CIWMP Review Report*. They are:

- (A) changes in demographics in the county;
- (B) changes in quantities of the waste within the county;
- (C) Changes in funding sources for administration of the countywide siting element and summary plan;
- (D) changes in administrative responsibilities;
- (E) program implementation status;
- (F) changes in permitted disposal capacity and quantities of waste disposed of in the county;
- (G) changes in available markets for recyclable materials; and
- (H) changes in the implementation schedule.

On October 30, 1998 and again on July 21, 2000, the CIWMB Office of Local Assistance sent letters to jurisdictions clarifying the CIWMB's oversight of the five-year revision process. A copy of the July 21st letter is included in Appendix C. The July 21st letter noted that the five-year anniversary is from the date of approval by the CIWMB of the CIWMP; that the CIWMB legal staff determined that jurisdictions can utilize their annual reports to update program information, if a revision is not determined by the jurisdiction to be necessary; and that if a revision is determined to be necessary, it may be submitted with the next annual report.

CHAPTER 3.0 BACKGROUND

The incorporated jurisdictions in the county include the City of Portola and the County Unincorporated Area. The SRRE, the Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE), and the Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE) for the City of Portola and the County plus the Countywide Siting Element (CSE) and the County Summary Plan (SP) comprise the CIWMP. The planning documents for each jurisdiction were approved by the CIWMB on the dates shown in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1. AB 939 Approval Dates for the City of Portola and Plumas County Planning Documents

Jurisdiction	SRRE	NDFE	HHWE	Siting Element	Summary Plan
City of Portola	10/23/96	10/23/96	10/23/96	N/A	N/A
Plumas County	10/27/94	10/27/94	10/27/94	7/30/96	7/30/96

The CIWMP was approved by the CIWMB on January 28th, 1998. Thus, the anniversary date for the first five-year CIWMP review is January 28th, 2003. The County and the city's long-term diversion goals are:

- 50% for the City; and
- 39% for the County.

The County requested and was approved for a permanent rural reduction in the 50% goal.

Neither jurisdiction has requested a SB 1066 time extension or alternative diversion requirement.

CHAPTER 4.0 PURPOSE

The purpose of this *CIWMP Review Report* is twofold:

- (1) To document the compliance of the County and the City with PRC 41822 and CCR 18788; and
- (2) To solicit a wider review, recommendations, and support for the course of action identified by the City and the County to achieve established diversion goals.

CHAPTER 5.0 LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW

The Plumas County LTF meets periodically, as necessary, to conduct business. The membership of the LTF is identified in Appendix D.

The LTF met on March 25th and April 28th, 2004 to discuss the five-year review. A packet of information was prepared and provided to each member. A copy of the materials provided to the LTF is included in Appendix E. Following the 2nd meeting, the LTF concluded that the CIWMP, with the addition of the information in the annual reports, was adequate and did not need to be revised at this time. The LTF approved that a letter to be sent to the County, which transmitted the LTF's recommendations. A copy of the letter was also mailed to the CIWMB. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix F.

CHAPTER 6.0 SECTION 18788 (3) (A) THROUGH (H) ISSUES

OVERVIEW

California Waste Associates reviewed each CIWMP component document and found that the documents, accompanied by the annual reports, continue to serve as appropriate reference tools for implementing and monitoring compliance with AB 939. The Summary Plan adequately summarizes the solid waste and household hazardous waste management infrastructure within the County.

The CIWMP goals, objectives, and policies are still applicable and consistent with PRC 40051 and 40052. The selected programs for each component were reviewed. Nearly all programs were being implemented. The annual reports and the Planning Annual Report Information System (PARIS) for the County and the City are up to date. Although there have been some changes in program implementation, schedules, costs, and results, these changes are not considered to be significant.

Furthermore, it is felt that continued emphasis on program development, evaluation, and implementation are more important than refining the CIWMP documents through a revision.

The diversion performance for the City and the County each is shown in Table 6-1. The historical diversion rates reflect the impact of diversion program performance.

Table 6-1. Diversion Rate Trends (1990, 1995-2002) *

Year	City of Portola	Unincorporated County
1990	28%	57%
1995	Not Determinable	37%
1996	Not Determinable	39%
1997	22%	45%
1998	28% **	44%
1999	46% **	36%
2000	44% **	41%
2001	21%	46%
2002	32%	39%

* Source: CIWMB Website - Diversion Rate Summary (Results).

** Determined by using the generation-based method.

DEMOGRAPHICS

The standard calculation method of the diversion rates for both jurisdictions depends upon CIWMB-default adjustment factors, for example: population, employment, taxable sales, and the consumer price index (CPI). However, the City has used the generation-based method for measuring its diversion rate for some years (1998-2000). Table 6-2 depicts demographic trends from 1990 to 2002. Countywide population and employment have increased 6% and 14%, respectively, from 1990 to 2002. The increased population and employment gains represent a growth rate approximating ½ to 1% per year.

Table 6-2. Demographic Trends (1990-2002) *

Demographic Factor	1990	2002	% Change	% Change/Year
Population				
City of Portola	2,193	2,200	0.32%	0.03%
Unincorporated Area	17,546	20,950	6.86%	0.57%
Countywide	19,739	20,950	6.14%	0.51%
Employment (Industrial)				
Countywide	6,460	7,370	14.09%	1.17%
Taxable Sales Transactions				
City of Portola	\$10,285,000	\$14,173,000	37.80%	3.15%
Unincorporated Area	\$92,226,000	\$132,557,000	43.73%	3.64%
Countywide	\$133,057,000	\$201,368,000	51.34%	4.28%
Consumer Price Index (CPI)				
Statewide	135.0	186.1	37.85%	3.15%

* Source: CIWMB Website (www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/DivMeasure/JuAdjFac.asp), CIWMB Default Adjustment Factors, February 5, 2004.

The greatest population increase occurred in the unincorporated area of the County (nearly 7%). Taxable sales transactions have increased in both jurisdictions, averaging 51% countywide, while the statewide CPI increased 38% from 1990 to 2002.

Plumas County Five-Year CIWMP Review Report

These factors are important because they are used to calculate the estimated waste generation and diversion rates when using the CIWMB method for diversion rate measurement. Additionally, this level of demographic growth infers increased waste generation. Yet, when evaluated on a yearly basis, the increase in countywide population averages less than 0.51% per annum; in employment, 1.17% per year; taxable sales, less than 5% per year; and for the CPI, the increase was 3% per annum. Thus, although growth in the demographic factors did occur, it was not significant.

The demographic factors identified in Table 6-2 are used in the CIWMB adjustment methodology to project waste generation estimates for reporting years and determine the diversion rate for each jurisdiction. Generally, the greater the increase in the demographic factors, the greater is the estimated waste generation.

The source of waste generation by sector is identified in Table 6-3, which presents the percentage of the waste stream generated from the residential sector (single family homes and household units up to four households) and the nonresidential sector (e.g., commercial and industrial enterprises).

Table 6-3. Source of Base Year Waste Generation by Sector *

Jurisdiction	Base Year	Residential Percentage	Nonresidential Percentage
City of Portola	1990	61%	39%
County Unincorporated Area	1990	26%	74%

* 2002 AB 939 Electronic Annual Report for each jurisdiction.

The residential sector is further divided by type of dwelling in Table 6-4.

Table 6-4. Residential Sector Household Dwelling Trends (1990-2002) *

Demographic Factor	1990	2002	% Change	% Change/Year
Single Family Dwellings				
City of Portola	735	779	6.0%	0.5%
Unincorporated Area	8,309	10,092	21.5%	1.8%
Countywide	9,044	10,871	20.2%	1.7%
Multi-Family Dwellings				
City of Portola	203	182	-10.0%	-0.1%
Unincorporated Area	883	589	-33.3%	-2.8%
Countywide	1,086	771	-29.0%	-2.4%
Mobile Homes				
City of Portola	64	52	-18.8%	-1.6%
Unincorporated Area	1,748	2,008	14.9%	1.2%
Countywide	1,812	2,060	13.7%	1.1%

* Source: Department of Finance Demographic Data, (www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRP/E-5text.htm for 1990 data, www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRP/E-5text2.htm for 2002 data), March 22, 2004.

QUANTITIES OF WASTE

Waste Generation. CIWMB-approved base year waste generation (BYWG) and BY residential waste generation quantities are presented in Table 6-5 for each jurisdiction. Table 6-5 provides the baseline waste generation level from which future waste generation is derived.

Table 6-5. Base Year Total Waste Generation *

Jurisdiction	Base Year	BYWG (tons)	Base Year Population	BY WG Per Capita (ppd)	% Residential	BY Residential WG (tons)
City of Portola	1990	1,431	2,193	3.58	61.4%	879
Unincorporated Area	1990	28,149	17,546	8.79	25.8%	7,262
Countywide	1990	29,580	19,739	8.21	27.5%	8,141

* Source: CIWMB Website, Diversion Rate Measurement Calculation.

The per capita waste generation is included in Table 6-5. The statewide average per capita waste generation is approximately 10 pounds per person per day. The City and County's have base year per capita's lower than the statewide average with the City's being notably lower than the statewide average. The abnormally low per capita rate for the City suggests that perhaps the base year waste generation does not accurately represent the level of waste generation in the City.

The CIWMB adjustment methodology was used to derive the estimated reporting year waste generation levels for each jurisdiction. The results are presented in Table 6-6.

According to the adjustment methodology, waste generation has increased for both jurisdictions from 1990 levels. However, it is difficult to deduce a meaningful interpretation of waste generation changes due to the following reasons:

- The City used the generation-based methodology in 1998, 1999, and 2000; and
- The County requested and was approved for a base year waste generation correction in 1997.

On the other the hand, using the adjustment methodology to estimate waste generation in 2002 yields the following results:

- The City's waste generation increased by 145 tons from 1990 to 2002 (10%); and
- The County's waste generation increased by 3,175 tons (31,324 less 28,149 tons) from 1990 to 2002 (11%).

This growth in waste generation, according to the adjustment methodology, was minimal, approximating less than 1% per annum for each jurisdiction. This infers that program implementation does not need to be assessed for the capability of addressing significant growth in the waste stream, although program implementation should be sustained and enhanced to achieve increased levels of cost-effective diversion.

Table 6-6. City/County Waste Generation, Disposal, and Diversion Trends (1990 - 2002)

Year	BYWG (tons)	RYWG (tons)	% Change RYWG *	Disposal (tons)	% Change Disposal *	Diversion (tons)	% Diversion Rate (DR)	DR Measurement Method
------	----------------	----------------	--------------------	--------------------	------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Plumas County Unincorporated

1990	22,497	22,497		9,653		12,844	57%	Base Year WGS
1995	22,497	23,036	2%	14,500	50%	8,536	37%	AM
1996	22,497	22,324	-3%	15,873	9%	6,451	29%	AM
1997 **	28,149	28,248	27%	15,662	-1%	12,586	45%	BYC w/ AM
1998	28,149	27,188	-4%	15,288	-2%	11,900	44%	AM
1999	28,149	27,656	2%	17,641	15%	10,015	36%	AM
2000	28,149	28,903	5%	16,973	-4%	11,930	41%	AM
2001	28,149	31,015	7%	16,638	-2%	14,377	46%	AM
2002	28,149	31,324	1%	18,984	14%	12,340	39%	AM
1990 to 2002			11%		97%			
2003								

City of Portola

1990	1,431	1,431		1,037		394	28%	Base Year WGS
1995				1,264	22%			
1996				1,218	-4%			
1997	1,431	1,487		1,167	-4%	320	22%	AM
1998 ***		3,095	108%	2,237	92%	858	28%	Generation Based
1999 ***		3,140	1%	1,683	-25%	1,457	46%	Generation Based
2000 ***		2,322	-26%	1,307	-22%	1,015	44%	Generation Based
2001	1,431	1,560	-33%	1,236	-5%	324	21%	AM
2002	1,431	1,576	1%	1,075	-13%	501	32%	AM
1990 to 2002			10%		4%			
2003								

City/County Combined

1990	23,928	29,580		10,690		13,238	45%	
1995				15,764	47%			
1996				17,091	8%			
1997	29,580	29,735		16,829	-2%	12,906	43%	
1998		30,283	2%	17,525	4%	12,758	42%	
1999		30,796	2%	19,324	10%	11,472	37%	
2000		31,225	1%	18,280	-5%	12,945	41%	
2001	29,580	32,575	4%	17,874	-2%	14,701	45%	
2002	29,580	32,900	1%	20,059	12%	12,841	39%	
1990 to 2002		0	11%		88%			
2003								

* Year to year change except for 1990 to 2002 line.

** Base year waste generation correction approved for the County in 1997.

*** Generation-based diversion measurement for the City in 1998, 1999, and 2000.

Waste Disposal Quantities. Table 6-6 also includes the reported waste disposal quantities for each jurisdiction for the years 1990 and 1995 through 2002. This Table also includes an analysis of the per annum increase (or decrease) for the County and the City during the period 1990 and 1995 through 2002.

Reported disposal tonnages have:

- Decreased notably (15%) in the City (189 tons); and
- Increased significantly (31%) in the County unincorporated area from 1995 to 2002 (4,484 tons).

Table 6-7 depicts the disposal quantities, which were projected in the SRRE for 2000, and compares the projections with the reported disposal tonnage for 2000 for both jurisdictions.

Table 6-7. Comparison of Projected SRRE Disposal with Reported Disposal for Year 2000

Jurisdiction	Year 2000 Disposal Tonnage		% Difference
	SRRE Projected	Reported (DRS) *	
City of Portola	771 **	1,307	+ 70%
County Unincorporated Area	6,415 ***	16,973	+ 164%
Countywide	7,186	18,280	+ 154%

* Source of data from CIWMB Disposal Reporting System (DRS).

** Source of data from City SRRE Page 14.

*** Source of data from CIWMB Agenda Item at October 20, 1994 CIWMB Board meeting when SRRE was approved.

Waste Diversion. Waste diversion quantities are also identified in Table 6-6 for 1990 and 1995-2002. The 1990 diversion tonnage was reported in the SRRE's of both jurisdictions – the result of each jurisdiction's original waste generation study. The 1995-2002 diversion quantities were either determined by a generation-based study (City of Portola for 1998-2000) or the adjustment methodology. The diversion resulting from the adjustment methodology is considered "inferred" diversion because no diversion study was conducted (other than for the City in 1998-2000). The trends do not provide any meaningful insight into diversion performance because of the fluctuating levels of "inferred" diversion.

Table 6-8 presents the biennial review status and determinations resulting from CIWMB staff biennial reviews.

FUNDING SOURCES

No significant changes have occurred in the basic funding sources for the administration of the CSE and the Summary Plan. The primary sources of funding for program implementation are the service rates, franchise fees (where the private sector is the service provider), improved property assessments, and grant funds.

The funding sources identified for jurisdiction in its SRRE are summarized in Table 6-9

Plumas County Five-Year CIWMP Review Report

Table 6-8. Biennial Review Status for Both Jurisdictions (1995-2000) *

Jurisdiction	Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
City of Portola	1995	N/A	Compliance Fulfilled **
	1996	N/A	Compliance Fulfilled **
	1997	22%	Board Accepted
	1998	28%	Board Accepted
	1999	46%	Board Approved GFE ***
	2000	44%	Board Approved GFE ***
	2001	21%	BR Not Yet Completed
	2002	32%	BR Not Yet Completed
Plumas County	1995	37%	Board Approved
	1996	29%	Board Approved
	1997	45%	Board Accepted
	1998	44%	Board Accepted
	1999	36%	Board Approved
	2000	41%	Board Approved ****
	2001	46%	BR Not Yet Completed
	2002	39%	BR Not Yet Completed

- * Compliance determined for 1995-1999 based upon 25% diversion goal.
- ** Compliance fulfilled through a compliance schedule but the Board did not approve a diversion rate due to inaccurate base year data or other issues.
- *** GFE stands for "good faith effort".
- **** The Board approved a reduced rural diversion requirement of 39%.

Table 6-9. AB 939 Program Funding Sources for the County and the City *

Funding Source	City of Portola	Unincorporated
Enterprise Fund (e.g., Solid Waste Generation Fee)	✓	
Facility Gate Fee Surcharge	✓	✓
General Obligation Bonds	✓ (future)	✓ (future)
General Tax Revenues	✓	✓
Grants (CIWMB, DOC)	✓	✓
Parcel Charges	✓	✓
Service Fees/Rates, Gate Fees	✓	✓

No significant changes have occurred in the basic funding sources for the administration of the CSE and the Summary Plan. However, discussions are underway about the continued application of the Solid Waste Generation fee. The primary sources of funding diversion programs are through service rates and gate fee surcharges.

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES

Although there has been some reorganization of responsible personnel, no significant changes have occurred in the administration of the CIWMP. Within the County, the Department of Public Works has been assigned the responsibility for solid waste management. Previously, the responsible entity was the County Planning Department. Solid waste management activities within the City have been assigned to the City of Portola City Manager's Office

Plumas County Five-Year CIWMP Review Report

The County and City have advised the CIWMB from year-to-year of the primary responsible individuals for AB 939 in their annual reports.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Summary Plan. The Countywide Summary Plan, dated December, 1995, included goals, policies, and objectives for the City and County to promote countywide integrated waste management. These goals, policies, and objectives are listed below. All are still applicable.

Goals. The Summary Plan listed the following goals in Chapter 2 of the plan on page 5.

- 1) To provide for the safe, efficient, and cost effective removal of waste from residences, businesses and industry.
- 2) To provide adequate disposal capacity at local or regional landfills for waste generated in the City and County.
- 4) To reduce the amount of waste disposed of in landfills by:
 - reducing the amount of waste generated (i.e., source reduction);
 - maximizing the recycling of generated waste;
 - utilizing the energy and nutrient value of generated waste through composting or waste-to-energy incineration; and
 - disposing of the remaining waste in a safe and environmentally sound manner at local or regional landfills.
- 4) To assure the development of recycling, composting, waste transfer, and disposal facilities which satisfy the highest established environmental standards and regulations.
- 5) To Provide for the safe and efficient handling of household hazardous waste and special wastes.

Policies. The following countywide waste management policies were stated in the Summary Plan on pages 5-6 of Chapter 2. The policies are intended to reduce costs, streamline administration of programs, and encourage a coordinated and carefully planned approach to implementing integrated waste management.

- 1) Similar programs selected by each jurisdiction should be combined when and is this will result in the achievement of economies of scale in capitalizing and operating programs, and as long as such consolidation does not conflict with the interests of the jurisdictions.
- 2) The City and the County will work together to ensure that new diversion and disposal facilities are appropriately sized, designed, and sited, in order to avoid duplication of effort, unnecessary expenditure of funds, and environmental

Plumas County Five-Year CIWMP Review Report

degradation, and so that the specific integrated waste management needs of each jurisdiction are met.

- 3) In order to avoid duplication of effort and confusion, the City and the County will maintain the County Integrated Waste Management Task Force to coordinate and oversee implementation of new integrated waste management programs, to administer programs selected for countywide implementation, and to address issues of regional or countywide concern, as these arise.

Objectives. Five countywide waste management objectives were stated in the Summary Plan on page 6 of Chapter 2. They are:

- 1) Plumas County and the City of Portola will implement an integrated waste management system in which a majority of the waste stream is diverted from landfill disposal. Specifically, each jurisdiction will divert at least 25% of 1990 base year materials by 1995, and 50% by the year 2000.
- 2) Source reduction programs will be designed to achieve at least 1.5% diversion in the short term, and 3.9% in the medium term.
- 3) Recycling programs will be designed to achieve at least 11.2% in the short term, and 20% in the medium term.
- 4) Centralized composting of yard wastes may divert 2.7% of the generated wastes in the year 2000.
- 5) Special waste programs will achieve 52.6% in the short term and 51.3% in the medium term.

Annual Reporting. Both jurisdictions have submitted annual reports for reporting progress on an annual basis since 1995. The annual reports have provided updated information concerning program implementation. Nearly all selected programs have been implemented. Please see Tables 6-10, 6-11, and 6-12.

The following codes are used in Tables 6-10, 6-11, and 6-12.

- | | |
|----|---|
| SO | Selected Ongoing (Program selected in the SRRE and HHWE with continuing implementation.) |
| AO | Alternative Ongoing (Program not selected in the SRRE and HHWE but now being implemented.) |
| SI | Selected Implemented (Program selected in the SRRE/HHWE and completed.) |
| DE | Dropped in Earlier Year (Program selected in the SRRE/HHWE but dropped.) |
| NI | Selected and Not Implemented (Program selected in the SRRE/HHWE and not implemented.) |
| PF | Planned Future (Program selected in the SRRE/HHWE and implementation is planned in the future.) |

Table 6-10. Diversion Program Implementation Status in 2002 *

Program	#	City of Portola (2000)	City of Portola (2002)	County (2002)
Source Reduction Programs				
Xeri/Grasscycling	1000	101	AO (98 tons)	AO
Backyard Composting	1010		SO	SO
Business Waste Reduction	1020		SO	SO
Procurement	1030		SO	SO
School Source Reduction	1040			
Govt Source Reduction	1050		SO	SO
Material Exchange/Thrift	1060		SO	SO
Other Source Reduction	1070			
Recycling Programs				
Residential Curbside	2000	56	SO (21 tons)	SO (98 tons)
Residential Drop-off	2010	220	SO (306 tons)	SO (362 tons)
Buyback Centers	2020		SO	SO
Commercial Onsite P/U	2030	52	SO	SO (786 tons)
Commercial Self haul	2040			SO
Schools	2050		SO	SO
Government Recycling	2060		AO	SO
Special Collect/Seasonal	2070		AO	AO
Special Collection Events	2080		AO	
Other Recycling	2090			
MRF	7000			
Landfill	7010		AO	SO
Transfer Station	7020			AO
ADC	7040		AO (0 tons)	New (5 tons)
Composting Programs				
Residential Curbside GW	3000			
Residential GW Self haul	3010			SO
Commercial GW Pickup	3020			
Commercial GW Self haul	3030			AO
Food Waste Composting	3040			AO
School Composting	3050			
Government Composting	3060			
Other Composting	3070			
Composting Facility	7030			
ADC	7040			NI
Special Waste Diversion Programs				
Ash	4000			SO
Sludge	4010			
Tire Recycling	4020		SO (19 tons)	SO
White Goods	4030		SO	SO
Scrap Metal	4040	27	SO (222 tons)	SO
Wood Waste	4050		SO	SO (2,794 tons)
Concrete, Asphalt, Rubble	4060	560	SO (14 tons)	
Rendering	4090		AO	
Other Special Waste	4100			
Biomass/Co-generation Diversion				
Biomass/Cogeneration	8010			SO
Transformation/Tires	8020		SO	SO
Other Transformation	8030			NI

* Information obtained from CIWMB PARIS and jurisdictions' 2002 annual reports.

Table 6-11. HHW Management Program Implementation *

Program	#	City of Portola	County
Permanent Facility	9000	SO	SO
Mobile/Periodic Collection	9010	SO	SO
Curbside Collection	9020		
Waste Exchange	9030	NI	
Education Programs	9040	SO	SO
Other HHW Program	9050		

* Information obtained from CIWMB PARIS and jurisdictions' 2002 annual reports.

Table 6-12. Public Information Program Implementation *

Program	#	City of Portola	County
Electronic	5000	SO	SO
Print	5010	SO	SO
Outreach	5020	SO	SO
Schools	5030	SO	
Product and Landfill Bans	6000	SO	
Economic Incentives	6010	SO	SO
Ordinances	6020		SO
Other Policy Incentive	6030		

* Information obtained from CIWMB PARIS and jurisdictions' 2002 annual reports.

Table 6-10 also includes diversion tonnage for some programs, where reported by the County and the City in their 2002 annual reports.

Program implementation, as documented by each jurisdiction in the annual reports, has been sustained, enhanced, and, in some cases, expanded. Most selected programs have been implemented and some new programs started.

Nondisposal Facilities. Nondisposal facilities, which were identified in the Summary Plan, are listed in Table 6-13. Use of these facilities is continuing.

Table 6-13. Nondisposal Facilities Used or Planned for Use by Plumas County Jurisdictions

Name/Type of Facility	Location	Jurisdictions Served
Chester Transfer Station	Chester	County
Daw's Recycling Center	Portola	City and County
East Quincy Transfer Station	East Quincy	County
Gopher Hill GW Composting Facility (planned) *	Gopher Hill	County
Graeagle Transfer Station	Graeagle	County
Greenville Transfer Station	Greenville	County
LaPorte Transfer Station	LaPorte	County
Willow Glenn Transfer Station	Portola/Beckwourth	County

* Green waste composting facility planned but not currently being developed.

The Chester, East Quincy, and Greenville transfer stations also serve as drop-off recycling centers for CRV containers, non-CRV glass and plastic containers, corrugated cardboard, magazines, phone books, newspapers, tin cans, white office paper, used oil, oil filters, car batteries, and anti-freeze.

PERMITTED DISPOSAL CAPACITY

Permitted disposal capacity is available in the County at the Chester Landfill, which has 126,800 cubic yards of area remaining to fill. However, this landfill is planned as a backup to the Lockwood Landfill should some occurrence happen. Most wastes, which cannot be diverted, are transported out of county for disposal, primarily to the Lockwood Landfill. The Lockwood Landfill and the Chester Landfill have significantly more than 15 years disposal capacity for the solid wastes generated in Plumas County and the City of Portola.

The goals identified in the Countywide Siting Element (CSE), dated March 1994, are listed below for the integrated waste management of solid wastes generated within the county borders:

- 1) To provide for the safe, efficient, and cost effective removal of waste from residences, businesses and industry.
- 2) To provide adequate disposal capacity at local or regional landfills for waste generated in the City and County.
- 3) To reduce the amount of waste disposed of in landfills by:
 - reducing the amount of waste generated (i.e., source reduction);
 - maximizing the recycling of generated waste;
 - utilizing the energy and nutrient value of generated waste through composting or waste-to-energy incineration; and
 - disposing of the remaining waste in a safe and environmentally sound manner at local or regional landfills.
- 1) To assure the development of recycling, composting, waste transfer, and disposal facilities which satisfy the highest established environmental standards and regulations.
- 5) To Provide for the safe and efficient handling of household hazardous waste and special wastes.

These goals are identical with the goals stated in the Countywide Summary Plan. As stated earlier, these goals continue to be applicable.

Policies were also stated in the CSE in order to achieve the goals, namely:

- 1) **Long Term Disposal Capacity.** In order to provide for the safe and environmentally sound disposal of municipal solid waste which cannot be source

Consequently, the County feels that the most effective allocation of available resources at this time is to continue to utilize the existing CIWMP as a planning tool augmented by the annual reports. Countywide resources are best directed toward the development and implementation of programs rather than revising current planning documents. Where feasible and practical, increased efforts may be directed to quantifying (or estimating) diversion tonnages for implemented programs and recoverable materials. Each jurisdiction should update its annual report yearly to reflect current performance and identify any changes desired in program selection and implementation. In the 2002 annual reports, none of the jurisdictions reported that any of their planning elements needed to be revised. For these reasons, the County does not feel that revision of its CIWMP is warranted or desirable at this time.

CHAPTER 7.0 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

The following appendices are included in this section.

- Appendix A Relevant Sections of the Public Resources Code
- Appendix B California Code of Regulations Section 18788
- Appendix C July 21, 2000 CIWMB Letter
- Appendix D LTF membership
- Appendix E Presentation Outline for the LTF's March 25, 2004 Meeting
- Appendix F March 25, 2004 LTF Letter to the County

Plumas County Five-Year CIWMP Review Report

reduced, recycled, or composted, Plumas County will maintain a minimum of 15 year combined disposal capacity.

- 2) **Conservation of Existing Disposal Capacity.** In order to provide for long-term contingencies, and delay final closure of existing landfills, Plumas County seeks to conserve its existing in-county disposal capacity.
- 3) **Municipal Solid Waste Flow Control.** In order to provide for the collection, transport, recycling, and disposal of municipal solid waste generated within its borders, and to provide for the health and safety of its citizens, Plumas County advocates the right of local governments to designate the flow of generated wastes from the source of generation to a disposal or processing facility.
- 4) **Transfer of Municipal Solid Waste.** In order to provide for the safe and efficient transfer of municipal solid waste generated in the county to an out-of-county disposal facility, Plumas County will maintain a system of transfer stations.

The policies continue to be applicable to the CIWMP implementation. A siting criteria was developed and a siting process was described in the CSE, as required by the regulations.

AVAILABLE MARKETS

Markets for recovered recyclable materials have been variable. Though the market material quantity supply and demand and resulting market prices often fluctuate, outlets are available. The City and the County have generally relied upon the private sector for the marketability of recovered waste materials. Private sector opportunities for utilizing diverted materials as a feedstock for manufacturing purposes have also been facilitated through a designated "recycling market development zone" (RMDZ) named the Northeastern California RMDZ. This RMDZ includes Plumas County, in cooperation with Modoc and Lassen Counties and the Cities of Alturas, Susanville, and Portola. The RMDZ continues to target paper, yard and wood waste, plastics, glass, and ash.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

Changes in the implementation schedule have occurred but have not significantly affected the ability of the County and cities to realize planned diversion goals.

OTHER ISSUES

The goals, policies, and objectives stated in the Summary Plan remain applicable and relevant. The Local Task Force continues to meet on occasion, monitor countywide diversion performance, and provide useful input for the pursuit of AB 939 compliance strategies. Nearly all of the selected and contingent programs have been and are continuing to be implemented. Although a few programs have been revised, overall program implementation has been discussed in the annual reports and the PARIS has been kept updated. The County and City continue to monitor evolving compliance issues.